

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-6 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 3 and 5, cancels Claims 2 and 4, and adds new Claim 6 without introducing any new matter.

The outstanding Office Action objected to the Specification because the Title was not descriptive. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Takase et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,011, herein "Takase"). Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tateiwa (JP 2000-357743 A) in view of Takase.

Claims 2-3 and 5 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner Smoot for the courtesy of an interview granted to Applicant's representative on February 11, 2005, at which time the outstanding issues in this case were discussed.

In response to the objections to the Title of the Specification as not descriptive, the Title is amended as proposed in the outstanding Office Action,¹ to recite "Flip Chip Mounting Method Of Forming A Solder Bump On A Chip Pad That Is Exposed Through An Opening Formed In A Polyimide Film That Includes Utilizing Underfill To Bond The Chip To A Substrate." The change also finds support in the disclosure as originally filed.²

To vary the scope of protection recited in the claims, Claim 6 has been added. New Claim 6 recites a step of: forming a resist layer, selectively removing the insulation film and

¹ See the outstanding Office Action at page 2, lines 6-8.

² See Applicant's specification, for example in the Abstract.

removing the resist.³ Since this claim finds non-limiting support in the disclosure as originally filed, new Claim 6 is not believed to raise a question of new matter.⁴

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Claim 4 is cancelled. In view of the cancellation of Claim 4, it is believed that all claims are definite and no further rejection on that basis is anticipated.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), independent Claim 1 is amended to incorporate all the features of allowable objectionable Claim 2. Consequently, Claim 2 is cancelled. Claims 3 and 5 are amended to depend upon independent Claim 1. In light of these amendments, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is believed to be overcome and Applicant request reconsideration of Claim 1.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), since independent Claim 1 now recites all the features of allowable objectionable Claim 2, Applicant also requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 3 and 5-6 is earnestly solicited.


³ See Applicant's specification at page 5, lines 4-11 and in Figures 3 and 4.

⁴ See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\NS\02524\244081US\244081US-AM1-DRAFT2.DOC